



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/674,364 | 09/29/2003 | Michael Y. Lai | ITL.1482US (P16116) | 5221 |
| 21906 | 7590 | 11/06/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631 | | | TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2192 | | |
| | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | 11/06/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/674,364 | LAI, MICHAEL Y. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Isaac T. Tecklu | 2192 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 31 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): .

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: .

Claim(s) objected to: .

Claim(s) rejected: 1-57.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: .

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that Tye suggests to modify the IR to produce a final version of the IR that corresponds to instructions in the second instruction set but in no way suggests that the intermediate representation is modified "to more efficiently execute the one or more instructions for processing the bit field data".

It is respectfully submitted that a bit field is a common idiom used in computer programming to store a set of Boolean data type flags compactly, as a series of bits (emphasis added). Tye illustrates processing bit field in FIG. 43. Here at col. 57, lines 25-54, states "two types of example entries in the profile statistics 17c used to determine translation units of a routine are shown. The first entry type is a TARGET ADDRESS TYPE ENTRY 532 comprising a NON_NATIVE_TARGET_ADDRESS tag 536, a CALL_FLAG 538 and a COUNT 540. Each entry of this type comprises a unique non-native address 536 which is the target of a transfer of a control. A list of these entries is used to represent all the locations to which control has been transferred at run-time as recorded by the run-time interpreter in the profile statistics. Each entry is unique from every other entry of the list. The NON_NATIVE_TARGET_ADDRESS 536 functions as an identification tag or search index when searching for an entry amongst the profile statistics, as previously described, for example when the profile statistics are organized in a hash table. The CALL_FLAG 538 is a Boolean flag set to TRUE (bit) when the associated NON_NATIVE_TARGET_ADDRESS has been the target of a routine CALL. Otherwise, CALL_FLAG is FALSE (bit), COUNT 540 is an integer representing the total number of times control has been transferred to the associated NON_NATIVE_TARGET_ADDRESS. For example, if an instruction set comprises four instructions that transfer control, COUNT represents the number of times the associated NON_NATIVE_TARGET_ADDRESS has been the target address to which control has been transferred by the four instructions" (emphasis added).

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that intermediate representation is modified to more efficiently execute the one or more instructions for processing the bit field data, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention ("to more efficiently execute the one or more instruction for processing the bit field data") must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. That is to say, one has to prove that the prior art structure is incapable of efficiently executing the one or more instruction for processing the bit field data. See MPEP 2111.01.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER